

JUL 17 2007

Attorney Docket No. AGLE0061

U.S. Appl. Serial No 10/699,543

REMARKS

1. 35 USC 112

Applicant has amended Claim 13 to recite a dependency on Claim 12, as correctly understood by the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejection of one 35 USC 112 is deemed moot.

2. 35 USC 102

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Basore, et al (USPN 5,757,232).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-4. Applicant has not done so as a recognition, tacit or otherwise, of the merits of the Examiner's rejection of these claims in view of Basore. Rather, Applicant has merely cancelled these claims for purposes of expediency and convenience to narrow the issues in the application, and for further proceeding based upon this patent application.

With regard to Claim 5, applicant has added the limitations of Claim 10 thereto and, correspondingly, has cancelled Claim 10. Dependent Claims 6-9 remain in their original form.

With regard to Applicant's amendment to Claim 5, the limitation of "providing a chained command attribute. . ." is highly novel and not disclosed in Basore. In this regard, the Examiner is referred to Figures 6 and 7 of the present application, as well as Figures 10 and 11. The disclosure of Basore in Figure 3, which is relied upon by the Examiner in the Examiner's rejection, most narrowly tracks the example given by the Applicant in Figure 10, which is acknowledged by the Applicant as comprising the state of the art. On page 30 of the application,

Attorney Docket No. AGLE0061

U.S. Appl. Serial No 10/699,543

beginning at line 5, Applicant states, "The example in Figure 10 shows a typical user interface for the path a user must follow to change a favorite channel setting, i.e. from a first menu 101, to a second menu 102, to a third menu 103, to a fourth menu 104." It can be seen that the example given in Applicant's Figure 10 is almost identical to Figure 3 of the Basore reference.

In contrast thereto, Figure 11 in the subject application shows the use of a chained command, as now claimed in Claim 5. The Examiner is also referred to Figure 7 of the subject application. The use of a chained command as taught by Applicant allows a one-step targeted search. In comparing Figures 6 and 7 in the subject application, it can be seen that a step-by-step targeted search requires a series of steps to reach a particular result. In the example of chained commands in Figure 7, a pair of utterances are combined to cause a chained command to be issued, thereby producing the results desired in three steps instead of five steps. The advantage of such system is clear and well described in the subject application. No such method is taught or suggested by Basore. Accordingly, anticipation under 35 USC 102(b) is not shown in connection with Applicant's amended Claim 5 because Basore does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention. As such, Claim 5 and those claims depending therefrom, is deemed to be allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore indicated.

Applicant has not amended independent Claim 11. Claim 11 provides a "context manager." To demonstrate the presence of a context manager, the examiner refers to Basore's application 1 memory 161 to application N memory 163. However, these application memories have nothing to do with managing context. Rather, Basore states: "Figure 1 shows a plurality of application memory units labeled with reference numbers 161, 162, and 163. Each application memory unit, such as the memory 161, stores the phonetic spellings of certain words used in the particular application. For some applications, the application memory unit also stores application data that is relevant to the particular application." (Column 3, lines 37-44)

The fact that Basore provides memories for storing different phonetic spellings for different applications has nothing to do with context. Applicant's Figure 1 shows a

Attorney Docket No. AGLE0061

U.S. Appl. Serial No 10/699,543

context manager and Applicant (page 10, line 8-10) states that "the Context Manager 13 tells the Recognizer 12 to activate the appropriate grammars for the current context." No such function is provided in Basore. Examples of context are provided on page 31, line 25 - page 32, line 9. These contexts are also described starting on page 15, line 1. Accordingly, Claim 11 is not anticipated by Basore because Basore fails to teach at least a Context Manager. The memories described by the Examiner do not teach or suggest such Context Manager.

Claim 12 is also rejected as being anticipated by Basore. However, nothing in Basore teaches "defining an utterance that links two grammars and two parts." Nothing in Basore teaches a two-part utterance. The Examiner refers to a step-by-step approach as known in the art. In the invention, the individual utters two terms, such as the example provided in Figure 7. As a result, the first part of the utterance acts as a keyword to access information-type specific grammars (as was defined in the application) and the contents of a grammar to be linked are imported to include all alternatives for the second part. The use of a two-part utterance allows the provision of a chaining command, as discussed above in connection with amended Claim 5. As discussed therein, nothing in Basore teaches the notion of using a two-part utterance or of providing a chaining command. Rather, Basore is concerned merely with a step-by-step approach as is known in the art. Accordingly, Basore fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention and is therefore not a proper reference for teaching anticipation of the claimed invention under 35 USC 102(b). Thus, the Examiner is requested to withdraw such rejection.

Independent Claim 16 is also rejected as being anticipated by Basore. As with Claim 5, applicant has amended Claim 16 to include the limitations of a chained command attribute. As such, for the reasons asserted above in connection with Claim 5, Claim 16 is also deemed to be allowable.

Applicant has amended Claim 22 to place it into independent format by incorporating the limitations of independent Claim 16 therein. The Examiner asserts that subject matter of Claim 22, a "more like this" command, is taught by Basore. The Examiner's example, drawn from Figure 3, is inapposite. The use of

Attorney Docket No. AGLE0061

U.S. Appl. Serial No. 10/699,543

a step-by-step traverse of a hierarchical set of menus has nothing to do with the ability of the system to recognize a "more like this" command. As such, the rejection is erroneous. Nowhere in Basore is there any suggestion of such command. Accordingly, it is appropriate for the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claim 25 is also rejected by the Examiner in view of Basore. As stated above in connection with Claim 12, Claim 25, likewise, refers to an utterance that links two grammars and two parts. For all the reasons that Claim 12 is allowable, Claim 25, and the claims depending therefrom, is also allowable.

Claim 30 is also rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Basore. Claim 30 is directed to, *inter alia*, "means for using said parse structure to auto-generate at least some of said user interface for said application." Applicant is surprised by the Examiner's construction of Claim 30 in connection with Basore. There is nothing in Basore to indicate when commands are changed. In fact, the Examiner's recital of the hierarchical arrangement of grammars, supports the Applicant's contention that Basore teaches nothing more than the known technique of step-by-step hierarchical traversing of a series of menus. The claimed invention, refers to a use of chained commands, which is nowhere taught in Basore. Further, there is nothing in Basore for parsing grammars to obtain a structure. The phonetic acoustic models 126 referred by the Examiner have nothing to do with parsing grammars to obtain structure. Finally, there is nothing in Basore to teach auto-generation of a user interface. The recital of a printer and display by the Examiner is far-fetched at best. In fact, there is no credible way to read Basore on the invention as claimed in Claim 30, and the only appropriate action for the Examiner is to withdraw this rejection.

In summary, Applicant has cancelled claims, amended claims, and retained claims in their original state, based on the Examiner's rejection thereof under 35 USC 102(b) in view of Basore. Applicant's cancelling and amending of claims has been performed for purposes of expedience and to place the claims in better condition for allowance. Such cancelling or amending claims should not be construed as a concession on the part of Applicant that the rejections have merit.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.


As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

Attorney Docket No. AGLE0061

U.S. Appl. Serial No 10/699,543

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22,862